

US Serial No. 10/554344  
Page 4 of 9

Remarks:

*Amendments to the claims:*

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 2 and 10 are amended to address claim objections.

No new matter is added to the application by this Amendment.

*Regarding the objection of claims 2 and 10 for allegedly informalities:*

Applicants respectfully traverse the objections of the foregoing claims.

In response to the objections, claim 2 was amended to remove the term "comtemplates" therein; and claim 10 was amended to replace the term "are" with the term "includes" as suggested by the Patent Office. Applicants submit that the amendments to claims 2 and 10 overcome the claim objections as set forth in the Office Action.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to the claims.

*Regarding the rejection of claims 1-3 and 9 under 35 USC 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0005620 to Ananth et al. (hereinafter "Ananth"):*

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of the foregoing claims in view of Ananth.

Prior to discussing the relative merits of the Examiner's rejection, Applicants point out that unpatentability based on "anticipation" type rejection under 35 USC 102 requires that the invention is not in fact new. See *Hoover Group, Inc. v. Custom Metalcraft, Inc.*, 66 F.3d 299, 302, 36 USPQ2d 1101, 1103 (Fed. Cir. 1995) ("lack of novelty (often called 'anticipation') requires that the same invention, including each element and limitation of the claims, was known or used by others before it was invented by the patentee").

Anticipation requires that a *single reference* [emphasis added] describe the claimed invention with sufficient precision and detail to establish that the subject matter existed in

US Serial No. 10/554344  
Page 5 of 9

the prior art. See, *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 708, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1657 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

The principle of "inherency," in the law of anticipation, requires that any information missing from the reference would nonetheless be known to be present in the subject matter of the reference, when viewed by persons experienced in the field of the invention. However, "anticipation by inherent disclosure is appropriate only when the reference discloses prior art that must necessarily include the unstated limitation, [or the reference] cannot inherently anticipate the claims." *Transclean Corp. v. Bridgewood Servs., Inc.*, 290 F.3d 1364, 1373 [62 USPQ2d 1865] (Fed. Cir. 2002); *Hitzeman v. Rutter*, 243 F.3d 1345, 1355 [58 USPQ2d 1161] (Fed. Cir. 2001) ("consistent with the law of anticipation, an inherent property must necessarily be present in the invention described by the count, and it must be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill in the art"); *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745 [49 USPQ2d 1949] (Fed. Cir. 1999) (that a feature in the prior art reference "could" operate as claimed does not establish inherency).

Thus when a claim limitation is not explicitly set forth in a reference, evidence "must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill." *Continental Can Co.*, 948 F.2d at 1268. It is not sufficient if a material element or limitation is "merely probably or possibly present" in the prior art. *Trintec Indus., Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 1295 [63 USPQ2d 1597] (Fed. Cir. 2002). See also, *W.L. Gore v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d at 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (anticipation "cannot be predicated on mere conjecture respecting the characteristics of products that might result from the practice of processes disclosed in references"); *In re Oelrich*, 666 F.2d 578, 581 [212 USPQ 323] (CCPA 1982) (to anticipate, the asserted inherent function must be present in the prior art).

Nowhere does Ananth teach or suggest a housing element adapted to engage the shaped recess when the dispensing device is assembled as required by independent claims 1 and 2.

US Serial No. 10/554344  
Page 6 of 9

The present invention relates to a dispensing device comprising a refill and a housing element, i.e., an element which contributes to the housing. With the present invention, when the refill and the housing element are assembled to form the dispensing device, the housing element is engaged within the shaped recess in the upper portion of the wick via the housing element adapted to engage the shaped recess when the dispensing device is assembled as specifically defined in claims 1 and 2 (see the Abstract and paragraph [0018] of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0239593 for the present application). Thus, the features of claims 1 and 2 avoid the problem of using inappropriately-dimensioned refills with the presently claimed dispensing device.

In contrast, Ananth discloses a sleeve which merely covers the wick. The cavity in the wick of Ananth helps provide a burst of vapor that is ready when the device is first heated (see paragraph [0016] of Ananth). Moreover, Ananth teaches that the cavity (and the walls adjacent thereto) collect liquid from the container through the wick by means of capillary action, forming a pool of liquid in the cavity (see paragraph [0046] of Ananth). At best, Ananth teaches that the wick is preferably covered with a metal sleeve, plastic film, or paint (see paragraph [0046] of Ananth).

In no way does a metal sleeve that merely covers the wick of Ananth disclose a metal sleeve that engages the recess of Ananth. Contrary to the Patent Office's allegations, the metal sleeve of Ananth *does not* engage the cavity in the system of Ananth as recited in claims 1 and 2.

According to the Shorter Oxford English Dictionary, the term "engaging" is clearly defined and, as part of a mechanism, means: "come into contact with or fit into a corresponding part, so as to prevent or transmit movement" (see attached copy of page 820 including the definition of the term "engage" from the Shorter Oxford English Dictionary). The metal sleeve as taught in Ananth clearly fails to disclose that the sleeve engages the cavity within the well-defined definition meaning of the term "engaging."

Applicants further point out that the reference sign (32) of Ananth is used for two distinct and different features in Ananth, namely, the reference sign (32) refers to the

US Serial No. 10/554344  
Page 7 of 9

perforations of a sleeve in FIG. 1 of Ananth and a cavity in the upper end of the wick in FIG. 8 of Ananth.

In view of the teachings of Ananth and the well-defined definition of the term "engage", Ananth clearly fails to disclose a housing element adapted to engage the shaped recess when the dispensing device is assembled as recited in claims 1 and 2 of the present application.

Because the features of independent claim 1 are not disclosed by Ananth, Ananth cannot anticipate, nor would not have rendered obvious, the features specifically defined in claim 1 and its dependent claims.

For at least these reasons, claims 1-3 and 9 are patentably distinct from and/or non-obvious in view of Ananth. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) are respectfully requested.

*Regarding the rejection of claims 4-8 and 10 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ananth:*

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of the foregoing claims in view Ananth.

The Patent Office alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized modifying the teachings of Ananth would achieve the features recited in claims 4-8 and 10. Applicants disagree with these allegations.

Even if one of ordinary skill in the art would have modified the teachings of Ananth as alleged by the Patent Office, such modifications of Ananth would not achieve the present invention defined in independent claim 1, from which claims 4-8 depend.

As set forth above with respect to claim 1, Ananth fails to teach or suggest a housing element adapted to engage the shaped recess in the upper portion of the porous wick when the dispensing device is assembled as required by claim 1.

US Serial No. 10/554344  
Page 8 of 9

Because the features of independent claim 1 are not taught or suggested by Ananth, Ananth would not have rendered the features of claims 4-8 and 10, which depend from claim 1, obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

*Regarding the rejection of claim 11 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ananth in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,361,752 to Demarest et al. (hereinafter "Demarest")):*

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the foregoing claims in view of Ananth and Demarest.

The Patent Office acknowledges that Ananth does not teach or suggest using a fan (see page 6 of the Office Action). The Patent Office introduces Demarest as allegedly teaching use of a fan to dispense volatile material from a reservoir through a wick in order to move air across the material and blow the resultant vapor into the surrounding environment (see the paragraph bridging pages 6 and 7 of the Office Action). Applicants disagree with these allegations.

Demarest fails to remedies the deficiencies of Ananth as set forth above with respect to claim 1, from which claim 11 depends. At best, Demarest discloses that if a liquid volatile material or carrier substance is to be heated by the coil to vaporize the volatile material, the apparatus includes a wick that is in contact with the liquid and extends to the vicinity of the coil to transport the liquid to the coil for heating (see col. 2, lines 45-54).

Thus, Ananth and Demarest, taken singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest a housing element adapted to engage the shaped recess when the dispensing device is assembled as recited in claim 1, from which claim 11 depends.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

009/010

US Serial No. 10/554344  
Page 9 of 9

OCT 20 2008

Because these features of independent claims 1 are not taught or suggested by Ananth and Demarest, taken singly or in combination, the references would not have rendered the features of claim 11 obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner in charge of this application believe that telephonic communication with the undersigned would meaningfully advance the prosecution of this application, they are invited to call the undersigned at their earliest convenience. The early issuance of a *Notice of Allowability* is solicited.

**CONDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR FEES**

Should any further fee be required by the Commissioner in order to permit the timely entry of this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any such fee to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

Respectfully Submitted;

Andrew N. Parfomak  
Andrew N. Parfomak, Esq.

20 October 2008

Date:

Reg. No. 32,431  
Norris, McLaughlin & Marcus  
875 Third Avenue, 18<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10022

Tel: 212 808-0700

**CERTIFICATE OF TELEFAX TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8**

I certify that this document, and any attachments thereto, addressed to the:  
"Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" is being telefax transmitted to (571) 273-8300 at the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Allyson Ross  
Allyson Ross

20 Oct. 2008

Date

C:\ANPCMB\102790\134\Amendment01.doc

